

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
GREENVILLE DIVISION

| | | |
|--|---|------------------------------------|
| Elzie Grover Williams, III, |) | |
| |) | |
| Plaintiff, |) | Civil Action No.: 6:15-cv-3663-TLW |
| |) | |
| v. |) | |
| |) | ORDER |
| Carolyn W. Colvin, Acting Commissioner |) | |
| of Social Security, |) | |
| |) | |
| Defendant. |) | |
| _____ |) | |

Plaintiff Elzie Grover Williams, III (“Plaintiff”) brought this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) and § 1383(c)(3) to obtain judicial review of a final decision of the Defendant, Acting Commissioner of Social Security (“Commissioner”), denying his claims for Disability Insurance Benefits and Supplemental Security Income Benefits. ECF No. 1. This matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) filed on December 20, 2016 by United States Magistrate Judge Kevin F. McDonald, to whom this case had previously been assigned pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(a), (D.S.C.). ECF No. 17. In the Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends affirming the Commissioner’s decision denying benefits. Objections were due on January 3, 2017, but Plaintiff did not file objections to the Report. The matter is now ripe for disposition.

The Court is charged with conducting a *de novo* review of any portion of the Report to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained therein. 28 U.S.C. § 636. However, in the absence of objections to the Report, the Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the Magistrate Judge’s recommendation. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 200 (4th Cir. 1983). In such a case, “a district

court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

In light of this standard, the Court has carefully reviewed the Report, the relevant filings, and the applicable law and notes that Plaintiff has not filed objections to the Report. It is hereby **ORDERED** that the Report, ECF No. 17, is **ACCEPTED**. For the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, the Commissioner’s decision is **AFFIRMED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Terry L. Wooten
TERRY L. WOOTEN
Chief United States District Judge

February 23, 2017
Columbia, South Carolina